













noon Mr. R. E. O.

[illegible]

Motions of censure are made from time to time for an Opposition to deal with. It is a tactical general rule, it is a tactical device, and it may succeed or fail; but there is no direct evidence of its success, for defeat does not furnish direct evidence of the weakness, without producing any nature of compensation, and even if it is strengthened—in the House, still, it is not to be denied to be occasions when, in the absence of well-defined principles, the force of motions of censure, though they do not result in respect of success. The answer to a question in such service to the country, and in the contestation of Victoria that the Melbourne Mint should stop the silver minting for New South Wales and divide the profits, is internal, but scarcely of the appropriate public claim of New South Wales—that, if there is to be silver minting by one Mint, it ought to be in the parent colony, and in that in which nearly all the silver is produced—is inconsistent. But, however, the assumption that the Mints thus share the coins should annex the profits; whereas, as a matter of fact, the claim of Australia to issue its own coins is established in principle, and it is the people who receive and use the coins that

If the colonies must for the time forego a portion of the profit of coinage.

Perhaps the reflection most naturally suggested to the mind by the correspondence between Sir HENRY PARKES and Sir GEORGE DIXON which was published yesterday, and which led to the publication, is the extraordinary nature of the logic which is thought to be good enough in Parliament and in public life. Sir HENRY PARKES charges the Government with having taken away the money in a case where he, in his own words, "has been expended by a Minister who goes on a mission of novel, undefined and unspecified character, in a case where I am myself, and in respect to which he refuses to give the slightest information to Parliament." Mr. LYNCH undertook to reply to this very distinctly-stated accusation, and, although he did so by alleging that Sir HENRY PARKES had, without the authority of Parliament, ordered the preparation of certain statutes. Next it is Sir HENRY PARKES's turn to be charged with having refused to state in advance of consulting Parliament, though there is good reason to believe that if he had submitted the question to Parliament, though he might have obtained the sanction of the Finance Committee, Parliament would have

that stage." He felt ought to share in the profits of the difference between the intrinsic and the minted value of the coin. On this principle, whatever profit silver coins may be made, should be divided among all the colonies of Australia, whether they have or have not branches of the Mint; and perhaps nothing more distinctly points than this does to the necessity for a federal system in Australia.

As to the telegrams, the Imperial Government suggests alternative ways in the carrying out of minting silver in Australia; either that the Australian Mint should issue silver tokens equivalent in intrinsic and nominal value to corresponding British coins, or that the circulation in Australia only; or that as agents for the British Mint the Australian Mints should issue silver coins in all respects identical with those issuing from the British Mint. In the former case the original profits, to be paid, to be divided equally among themselves; in the latter case they must share their profits with the Imperial Mint in London. The reason for this condition is apparent. For if the Australian Mints

unhesitatingly refused the vote. Now, however proper and even necessary it may be for a Minister to act on a Emergency without taking the opinion of the House, it is not equally desirable for a Minister to do on his own authority something which Parliament is entitled to pronounce upon, and which it would in all likelihood reject. The action of the Minister must be in anticipation of the disapproval of the House, and in anticipation of its disapproval. But let us go a little further. In the letter sent by the Premier to the ex-Premier there is much with which we can cordially agree. One such portion is the admission that it is "wholly inadvisable to lay down with authority the sound doctrine that it is "the duty of Governments, by whomsoever they may be led, to maintain the constitutional principle that no expenditure of public funds is to be made except in pursuance of the authority of Parliament, except in cases of pressing urgency." Nothing could be juster. But how does it harmonise with the fact that just about that time Sir George Downes was day by day refusing to inform Parliament with

for, for he was a moderate would, as he said, have addressed two paragraphs of the address on Thursday if he had intended to submit, at the time, a direct and explicit interference and to avoid interference he withheld his protest. We do not say how far tactics may be assigned for both action and the self-interest in the case, but both would be of no extent explicable on it. It cannot be doubted that the Sir HENRY PARKES of the rumours which had been abroad as to his proposed action, was, for a moment, been followed, the results were an embarrassment on the position, and a corresponding confidence and strength on the Government. As it is the case, the Opposition leader may yet through his language on

of the debate provides him with the opportunity of contending that he has won from his original plan of action.

Official records do not show any understanding abroad that the order Mr. RENN would give in his proposed direction to the House is that the day for moving would have been set down that is, the day after the close of the Premier. If it would be given to-day, there is no doubt that the date for the debate will be the 4th of August. Assuming that the resolution would be a constitutional amendment, it is to that a proposal by the Opposition to move a

British mintage, not only in the United Kingdom but throughout the Empire, and the acquisition of the British Mint in the production of silver money would be gone. On the other hand, it might be said that, in a spirit of equity, the people of the British islands, who so largely use our Sydney and Melbourne sovereigns, ought to pay us something for the cost incurred in their production, and for the saving they effect in the cost of working the Imperial Mint. As an enormous number of our Australian sovereigns are in circulation in the United Kingdom, this might be argued as a plea against the Imperial Mint's claiming a share in our profits in minting silver coins. As England takes our gold coins in exchange for silver, it is true, she might be called to take our silver coins into her circulation to our gain. But as, in the natural course of trade, and as

fact proceedings of a commercial master baker engaged in discussing the market price of bread. And what they show the public is that the bread tax of the present Ministry has increased the price of bread to every member of the community at the rate of about 16 per cent. According to the theory offered by the protectionists to their guileless believers the Victorian farmer, or merchant, or perhaps the local farmer, or somebody or other, ought to pay this thirty cents for his own profit, and not a penny of it should reach the consumer. It is a pretty theory, but unfortunately the fact does not correspond to it. The wheat holder is supposed to add and wanting flour is supposed to refuse to send him wheat or flour here unless he can get as good a price as he can obtain by selling it elsewhere. Therefore, to start with,



[illegible]







[illegible]



